

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/701,476 | FUJITA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Thanhha Pham | 2813 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: ____

 (1) Thanhha Pham.

(3) ____

 (2) David Soltz.

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 17 January 2006
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

17-19 and 24

Prior art documents discussed:

Allen et al [US 6,420,441] and Lukas et al [US 2004/0175957]
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Discussing amendment to independent claim 17 by incorporating limitation of claim 19 to claim 17 and suggesting claimed language to clarify more scope of claimed invention (see Examiner Amendment for details and Reason for Allowance)

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)